



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant	San Francisco Estuary Institute	County	Marin, Sonoma, Napa,
Project Title	Update to San Francisco Bay Region IRWM Plan for Climate Change Adaptation: Managing Risk to Water-Related Resources		Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Mateo & San Francisco
		Grant Request	\$157,444
		Total Project Cost	\$254,444

Project Description The objective of this proposal is to update the Bay Area IRWM plan to address the challenges of climate change for regional water management. Critical gaps have been recognized in the ability of the region to respond to predicted sea level rise impacts on the extensive and vulnerable San Francisco Bay shoreline. Many of these vulnerabilities are likely to disproportionately impact disadvantaged communities in low-lying areas along the Bay shore. This project will develop and synthesize critical information for identifying and evaluating these impacts and produce a set of accessible tools for incorporation into the Plan update. This component will make the Bay Area IRWM Plan more compliant for climate change planning by providing more detailed vulnerability assessment and adaptation strategies for the water-related infrastructure and ecological resources adjacent to the Bay's shoreline.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	6
Schedule	3
Budget	6
Program Preferences	4.5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	28.5

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan technically contains the two required sections as defined in the Planning Grant PSP: (1) "Current Status in Meeting IRWM Plan Standards" and (2) "Update Proposed in this Submission." However, there is little detail that defines the current progress of the IRWM Plan update. It is understood that the IRWM Region currently has a Round 1 Planning Grant and is in the process of updating the IWRM Plan to meet IRWM Plan Standards. It is also understood that the proposed work is not an IRWM Plan update, but is intended to address a specific portion of the IRWM Plan, (i.e., addressing climate change in the San Francisco Bay Area). The proposed work lacks detail as to which elements of the existing IRWM Plan would be improved by the proposed project. The Work Plan tasks also lack detail as to the actual work that will be performed (specifically in Task 3 and 5). Task 3 proposes to "integrate the products of Tasks 1 and 2 to create a set of conceptual adaptation strategies," but it does not explain what the process is for integrating the findings into the IRWM Plan or list the subtasks involved in the decision process. The description for Task 5 does not give the reviewers any sense of duration or level of effort for task activities. Task 6 does not discuss progress reports, but these are later listed in the Budget. For consistency throughout the Work Plan, Budget and Schedule, the subtasks should have been represented under each task.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. Task 4 (Community Engagement) of the Work Plan describes the intent to engage DACs in project meetings, but more detail should have been provided for how the region will identify DACs and ensure their participation in the proposed work. The Proposal states that the region will engage and reach out to DACs and tribes that are impacted by sea level rise and climate change processes by giving informative presentations at six meetings. However, the content or structure of these meetings, the extent of collaboration/coordination throughout these meetings, and the effectiveness of these meetings engaging DACs is unclear. More detail on specific outreach and engagement activities would be helpful. There is a strong connection with the SFEI's Tribal Initiative to facilitate coordination with local tribes, but there is no mention of an agency or affiliation that will help facilitate participation with DACs.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. The Schedule is not consistent with the Work Plan, as the subtasks presented in the Work Plan are not shown on the Schedule. The Schedule is lacking a sufficient level of detail (i.e., a description of milestones; when meetings will occur; when progress reports will be submitted, etc). The proposed work is scheduled to begin on August 6, 2012, and to finish in August 2014, which appears reasonable.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. With the information in the application, it is difficult to determine if the Budget is reasonable, as it lacks supporting documentation and explanatory text to justify the estimates. The Budget does not list hourly rates, number of engineers/consultants involved, or number of hours required to perform each individual task.
- **Program Preference** The proposal sufficiently documents that 9 of the 15 Program Preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.